REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24 and 27-29 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24 and 27-29 have been rejected.

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 13, and 22 have been amended.

Claim 15 has been cancelled.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24, 27 and 28 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as purportedly being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/688,094. Since this is a provisional rejection, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated in the copending application.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24, 27-28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,337,192 issued to Stark, et al. ("Stark"), and further in view of NPL_XML_Schema_CE, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,591,260 issued to Schwarzhoff, et al. ("Schwarzhoff"). As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully point out that the Office Action fails to provide a date for the XML schema reference that indicates the reference was available or well known at the time of invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this reference is not properly used as the basis for a § 103 rejection and respectfully request withdrawal of this reference.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose all elements of amended independent claim 1. Claim 1 recites a first translation from an application-specific data object format to a common data object format and a second translation from the common data object format to an application-specific data object format. That is,

claim 1 recites that two translations involving the invoice information are performed, and thus an intermediate data object format is employed between the translations from/to the two application-specific data object formats. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose such features, among others.

Stark discloses reading in an input file in a first format (e.g. Ariba) and mapping the data in the input file directly to a selected output file type (e.g. Visa XML). *See, e.g.*, Stark, 8:20-25. Thus, Stark discloses a single mapping from a first file type to a second file type. Among other shortcomings, Stark's teachings suffer from the drawback that such an approach requires storing an increased number of mappings from each input file type to each output file type, exponentially proportional to the number of file types supported ($O(n^2)$). *See, e.g.*, Stark, 7:17-21 ("Multiple templates and...libraries may be maintained within the tool 10 to allow the user to easily accommodate different business processes and partner's needs.") Thus, in Stark's system, a change to one input file type can affect a potentially enormous number of mappings from the altered file type to each and every other file type, and vice versa. Each of the affected mappings can be rendered ineffective based on a single change to a single input file type. In order to compensate for such a change, each of the potentially numerous mappings must be recreated or modified.

By contrast, Applicants' claims recite translating from a first application-specific data object format to a common data object format, and then from the common data object format to a second application-specific data object format. This intermediate common data object format (which is not disclosed by the cited references) effectively insulates a particular input data object format from all the other data object formats in the system. That is, a change to one application-specific data object format does not affect the mappings between the other application-specific data object formats to/from the common data object format. While the claimed invention's use of a two-step process obviously involves more operations, than implementing a single-step process, doing so provides increased flexibility and efficiency in customizing multiple data object formats in a system which deals with multiple different data object formats, among a number of other advantages.

Applicants have added claim 30. Support for this claim is found at ¶ [0027] of Applicants' Specification. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose each element of claim 30.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claim 1, as well as claims 10, 13, and 22, which contain substantially similar features, and all claims that depend therefrom, and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (512) 439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shawn Doman/

Shawn Doman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,362
Telephone: (512) 439-5092
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099

Application No.: 10/688,425